

Exhibit A (formerly Exhibit C) – updated to incorporate final commission recommendations

Resolution	Page and Section	Proposed Amendment	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation
<p>6. Change the way the sign height is measured to permit signs to be 42.5 feet above the elevation of the highest adjacent main travel lane (measured to the top of the sign face) for signs not on elevated travel ways, and 25 feet above the elevated travel way (measured from the highest elevated point of the travel way within 500 feet of the sign to the top of the sign face) for signs on elevated travel ways, but not within one-half mile of an interchange</p>	<p>25-10-152(B)(6)(d) Page 6 Lines 19-30 & Page 7 Lines 1 - 4</p>	<p>Modify the section to read as follows: (d) Sign district restrictions on sign height otherwise applicable to the relocation tract to no apply to the relocated sign, but the sign height of the relocated sign may not exceed: (i) <u>for signs not adjacent to elevated travel ways, an overall height of 42.5 feet measured from the highest point of the sign to the grade level of the centerline of the main-traveled way closest to the sign, at a point perpendicular to the sign location, or</u> (ii) <u>for a sign adjacent to an elevated travel way, 25 feet above the elevated travel lane of the main-traveled way, measured from the highest elevated point of the travel way within 500 feet of the sign, to the top of the sign face.</u> 2. <u>A sign is not eligible for the increased height allowed under this section if the sign is located within 2,640 feet of an interchange or intersection with elevated main-traveled lanes or elevated entrance or exit ramps. For purposes of this subsection, 2,640 feet is measured along the (outer edge of?) the highway from the nearest point of beginning or ending pavement widening at the exit from, or entrance to, the main-traveled way.</u></p>	<p>Current measurement (42 feet) is taken from ground level street pavement. In situations where an elevated highway is involved, measurement is taken from the nearest road, which is often times an access road, rather than from the elevated highway.</p> <p>Amendment allows a nonconforming sign to increase in height by not more than 25 feet above an elevated highway. For signs located adjacent to a non-elevated roadway, the 42.5 ft measurement would begin from the grade of the main traveled way.</p> <p>The 25 ft increase above the elevated travel lanes would not be authorized within ½ mile or 2640 ft of an interchange or intersection with elevated travel lanes.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Not Recommended</p>
<p>7. Clarify that a sign is deemed to be “adjacent” to an elevated travel way only if the sign face is oriented toward the travel way and the foundation of the sign is located no more than 500 feet away from the travel way at the closest point</p>	<p>25-10-152(B)(6)(d) Page 6 Lines 26-28</p>	<p>Add part 1 to (d)(ii) to read: 1. A sign is adjacent to an elevated travel way only if the sign face is oriented toward the travel way and the footing(s) of the sign are located no more than 500 feet away from the travel way at its closest point</p>	<p>No such clarification exists in the current code.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full) Not necessary w/o support of height measurement.</p>

Exhibit A (formerly Exhibit C) – updated to incorporate final commission recommendations

Resolution	Page and Section	Proposed Amendment	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation
<p>8. Allow the face size of newly-relocated signs to be as large as the total aggregate square footage of face size of all signs removed as a part of the relocation application up to a maximum of 672 square feet, and make signs where the aggregate does not reach a maximum of 672 square feet subject to a required overall 10% reduction in the total aggregate amount of square footage of the sign face size</p>	<p>25-10-152(B)(6)(e) Page 7 Lines 5-14</p>	<p>Add entire section: Sign district restrictions on sign face size otherwise applicable to the relocation tract do not apply to the relocated sign, but the face size of the relocated sign may not exceed that of the original sign, except that: (i) the face size of a relocated sign may be increased up to the total aggregate square footage of the face size of all signs removed as a part of a relocation application, up to a maximum of 672 square feet; (ii) if the aggregate of the face sizes of multiple signs does not reach a maximum of 672 square feet, the maximum sign face area shall be 10% less than the total aggregate amount of square footage of all the signs removed as part of the relocation application;</p>	<p>Currently, billboard companies cannot use more than one nonconforming sign to replace a nonconforming sign. Amendment allows the use of more than one nonconforming sign to be replaced by one nonconforming sign as long as the aggregate of the sign face is no more than 672 square feet. In cases when the aggregate does not reach the max 672 square feet, the relocated nonconforming sign face shall be 10% less than the aggregate sign face square footage of all the signs removed.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation. Design Commission opposes the concept of relocation and recommends eliminating the concept entirely. Planning Commission (full). Recommended with the following additions: all relocated signs must be removed before the new sign may be built; “relocated” signs are permitted to remain in place for a term of 10 yrs; the permitted term may be extended in six year increments if another sign of equal or larger size is removed for each 6 year period; each removed sign must have a sign face equal to or greater than the relocated sign face area; <u>when aggregating, the maximum size for the newly relocated sign is 300 square feet as opposed to 672 square feet.</u></p>
<p>9. Require energy-efficient, pollution reduction lighting of non-conforming off-premises signs for all relocation signs immediately and for all other signs within 36 months alter the first month the sign is registered following the date of adoption of the requirement</p>	<p>25-10-152(B)(6)(h) Page 8 Lines 7-14</p>	<p>Add new section: (h) The sign owner must install energy-efficient, pollution reduction lighting on each non-conforming off-premise sign: (i) For nonconforming off-premise signs relocated before February 21, 2008, on or before August 31, 2008; (ii) For nonconforming off-premise signs relocated after February 21, 2008, upon installation of the sign; (iii) For all other nonconforming off-premise signs, within 36 months after registration of the sign in accordance with Subsection (F).</p>	<p>The current code does not address energy efficient lighting for signs.</p>	<p>Design Commission. Recommended. Design Commission supports the “greening” of signs by requiring low wattage lamps for illuminating the signs at night. Planning Commission (full). Recommended with the additions: Energy efficient dark sky lighting is required within six months after the adoption of this amendment.</p>

Exhibit A (formerly Exhibit C) – updated to incorporate final commission recommendations

Resolution	Page and Section	Proposed Amendment	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation
<p>13. Establish a notice requirement to notify sign owners of the upcoming expiration of the registration of a sign no earlier than 90 days and no later than 30 days prior to the expiration and establishing that failure by the City to send such notice voids the prohibition against relocating signs if any signs owned by the sign owner within the City's jurisdiction are in violation of the registration requirements</p>	<p>25-10-152(F)(f) Page 9 Line 24 - 28</p>	<p>Add new section: (f) The building official shall notify a sign owner of the pending expiration of the registration of a sign, no earlier than 90 days and no later than 30 days prior to the expiration. If the building official fails to provide such notice the prohibition in subsection (e) above does not apply to that sign owner, until such notice has been provided.</p>	<p>The building official is not currently required to notify a sign owner that their sign is not registered. Amendment would place the responsibility upon the City to notify when a sign is not registered properly.</p>	<p>Design Commission. No specific recommendation. Planning Commission (full). Recommended with addition that sign owner or manager must provide an annual inventory of all owned and managed signs with their location, property owner, and description of the sign.</p>
<p>14. Impose registration requirements (including the requirement to pay a registration fee) upon taxis that advertise unrelated businesses</p>	<p>13-2-388 Ground Transportation Passenger Services Page 10 Lines 19-20</p>	<p>A franchise holder may affix an advertisement to a taxicab that does not obstruct the view of the driver, the visibility of signs, vehicle lights, or signal equipment required by this subchapter. <u>For each taxicab displaying an advertisement, the franchise holder shall pay a fee to be determined by separate ordinance.</u></p>	<p>There are currently no registration fees for taxi cabs to display advertisements. Amends Chapter 13, Transportation Code for Ground Transportation Passenger Services and requires an annual fee to display third party advertisements. The fees would be set by the Public Works Department and would be dependent upon the cost to administer the program.</p>	<p>Urban Transportation Commission. Recommended (4-3 in favor) Design Commission. Recommended, if such signage is allowed to continue and if the amount of the fee can be enough to actually pay for the cost of implementing and enforcing the program and still have funds left to defray the cost of enforcing the sign ordinance. But Prefers not to have advertising on Taxicabs. Planning Commission (full). Recommended</p>

Exhibit A (formerly Exhibit C) – updated to incorporate final commission recommendations

Additional Recommendations	Page and Section	Proposed Amendment	Current Code/Impact	Recommendation
<p>15. Planning Commission (CO rec) No sign may be relocated to within 1,000 ft of a residential zoning or use or within 800 feet of a school property.</p>	NA	NA	<p>Currently, signs may not be relocated within 500 ft of a residential structure in a residential base zoning district.</p> <p>Amendment would expand the limitation to 1,000 ft of a residential base zoning district or a residential use AND a 800 ft of a school property</p>	<p>Design Commission. Did not consider relocating signs within 1,000 ft of residential zoning or use. Recommends prohibiting the installation of a sign within 800 ft of a boundary of school property.</p> <p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended</p>
<p>16. Planning Commission (CO rec) Require identifying markers and additional info to be placed on signs (as determined by the Director of WPDRD)</p>	NA	NA	<p>Code does not currently require the sign to identified with any special markings for compliance.</p> <p>Amendment would require identifying markers such as registration number and markers to identify height of the structure as well as any other requirements as determined by the Director.</p>	<p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended</p>
<p>17. Planning Commission (CO rec) Relocated signs are limited to a face-for-a-face” but a double face sign may not be relocated to two separate locations and thereby become 2 single-face signs</p>	NA	NA	<p>Currently, staff practice is to require that a sign replace on a like for like basis. A two face sign must be relocated with a two face sign and a one face sign for a one face.</p> <p>Amendment would clarify the staff’s current practice as well as clarify that a two face sign could not be replaced with 2 single face signs.</p>	<p>Planning Commission (full). Recommended.</p>